

[NOT YET SCHEDULED FOR ORAL ARGUMENT]

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE  
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT**

---

VERA INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, *et al.*,

Defendants-Appellees.

---

No. 25-4248

**PLAINTIFFS-APPELLANTS' CONSENT MOTION FOR  
EXPEDITED BRIEFING SCHEDULE AND ORAL ARGUMENT**

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 27, plaintiffs-appellants respectfully move this Court to expedite this appeal and, specifically, to order the briefing schedule specified in ¶ 4 below. In light of impending harm to plaintiffs beginning October 1, 2025, we further respectfully request that the Court calendar the case for oral argument at its earliest convenience following the close of briefing. Defendants-appellees consent to this motion.

1. Plaintiffs are five entities that received federal grants issued by the Office of Justice Programs (OJP), a component of the U.S. Department of Justice. These grants were used to fund services such as

crime prevention measures and supports for crime victims. In April 2025, OJP terminated plaintiffs' grants and those of several hundred other recipients. Plaintiffs brought suit on behalf of themselves and a putative class of other entities whose grants were terminated, challenging the legality of the terminations and seeking to have those terminations set aside. On July 7, 2025, the district court dismissed the suit, concluding that it lacked jurisdiction over some of the claims and that the remainder did not succeed on the merits. *See* D. Ct. Dkt. Nos. 47 & 48.

2. The following day, plaintiffs noticed an appeal. Plaintiffs then sought an injunction pending appeal from the district court, arguing that their organizations, and the communities they serve, are facing irreparable harm from the funding loss. The government largely opposed that motion but agreed to an injunction preventing the re-obligation of the terminated grant funding of the five named plaintiffs before October 1, 2025. D. Ct. Dkt. No. 54 at 2. On July 21, the district court entered the limited injunction agreed to by the government but otherwise denied plaintiffs' motion. D. Ct. Dkt. No. 57. Thus, as things stand, plaintiffs are protected only until October 1, 2025, against having

their grant funds re-obligated. The district court expressly contemplated that this Court might grant “expedited review” in light of this deadline. *See id.* at 4.

3. Plaintiffs have filed an emergency motion for an injunction pending appeal in this Court. Briefing on that motion was completed on July 28 and it is currently pending.

4. In light of the ongoing harms that plaintiffs are suffering from the terminations of their grants and, particularly in view of the impending October 1 deadline, there is good cause to expedite this appeal. The parties have agreed to the following briefing schedule:

Opening Brief: August 11, 2025

Response Brief: September 2, 2025

Reply Brief: September 8, 2025

5. In light of these same considerations, including the October 1 deadline, plaintiffs further respectfully ask that the Court calendar this case for argument at its earliest convenience following the close of briefing. If this Court calendars the case for argument in September 2025, counsel for plaintiffs will arrange to be available on whatever date is selected by the Court.

6. Counsel for plaintiffs have conferred with counsel for the government and have been authorized to represent that this motion is unopposed.

Dated: July 30, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Lisa Newman

Joshua Perry  
Joshua Stanton  
E. Danya Perry  
Perry Law  
445 Park Avenue, 7th Floor  
New York, NY 10022  
(212) 251-2619  
jperry@danyaperrylaw.com

Lisa Newman  
Jennifer Fountain Connolly  
Cortney Robinson  
Somil Trivedi  
Joshua M. Salzman  
Brian Netter  
Democracy Forward Foundation  
P.O. Box 34553  
Washington, D.C. 20043  
(202) 448-9090  
lnewman@democracyforward.org

*Counsel for Plaintiffs-Appellants*

## **CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE**

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 32(g)(1), I hereby certify that this motion complies with Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 27(d)(1)(E) because it was prepared with Century Schoolbook 14-point, a proportionally spaced font, and the motion complies with Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 27(d)(2) because it contains 498 words, according to the word count of Microsoft Word.

/s/ Lisa Newman  
Lisa Newman